

BELLARMINE COMMENTARY

Vol. 2

MARCH, 1960

No. 3

CONTENTS

Articles

THE END FOR WHICH WE WERE CREATED	Desmond Donovan, S.J.	-	83				
FALLING SHORT OF GOD'S GLORY	-	-	Edward Yarnold, S.J.	-	87		
THE KING OF GLORY	-	-	-	Bryan O'Reilly, S.J.	-	90	
FELIX CULPA	-	-	-	-	Anthony Forrester, S.J.	-	93
REGNAVIT A LIGNO DEUS	-	-	-	Michael O'Halloran, S.J.	-	97	
THE PLACE WHERE THY GLORY DWELLS	-	Robert Murray, S.J.	-	102			

Notes and Comments

QUID RETRIBUAM DOMINO?	-	-	-	Amédée Payeur, S.J.	-	107
THE PRAISE OF HIS GLORY	-	-	-	Salvino Azzopardi, S.J.	-	109
MANIFEST IN GLORY	-	-	-	Luis Guillen, S.J.	-	111

Reviews

<i>The Tombs of St Peter and St Paul</i> (Engelbert Kirschbaum, S.J.); <i>The New Translations of the Bible</i> (E. H. Robertson); <i>For My Name's Sake</i> (Ronald Seth); <i>Children and Priest at Mass</i> (Hubert McEvoy, S.J.); <i>The Story of Jesus</i> (Eleanor Graham); <i>The Origin of Man</i> (Nicolas Corte).	113
---	-----

BELLARMINE COMMENTARY is produced twice yearly, for private circulation only, by the theologian scholastics of Heythrop College. All communications should be addressed to: The Editor, Bellarmine Commentary, Heythrop College, Chipping Norton, Oxon, England.

EDITORIAL

THIS issue of *Bellarmino Commentary* calls for a word of explanation. Hitherto the contents of each number have been devoted to topics from one or more of the treatises in dogmatic theology which the contributors had recently been studying. In this number we have aimed at grouping the articles and notes round a more precise theme. We have confined ourselves to the analysis of a single idea, the glory of God, and tried to study its implications in various contexts. Such a number will, we hope, provide a modest handbook of reference to the views of theologians on a particular question. Special account has been taken of books and articles published in the past twenty years or so.

* * * * *

Since the glory of God is the leitmotif of Jesuit spirituality, the most appropriate context in which to study the implications of this concept appeared to be the *Spiritual Exercises* of St Ignatius. In no sense has our aim been an exegesis of the text of the *Exercises*. Each article is a consideration of some aspect of God's glory which has an obvious bearing on certain leading meditations in the *Exercises*. Thus, the six main articles have been attached more or less closely to the Foundation, the Kingdom meditation and to each of the four 'Weeks'. Throughout these articles references giving a number only are to the numeration of the critical edition of the *Spiritual Exercises*. This numeration is found in most later editions, such as that published by Burns Oates and Washbourne Ltd., London, 1952, with a preface by Henry Keane, S.J.

* * * * *

The glory of God is a phrase often employed in praying, preaching and writing. It is one of the ultimate terms of theological language. Moreover, the concept of glory is somewhat nebulous and difficult to express adequately. Hence, analysis of it may seem impossible, or at least to admit of only the briefest treatment. Yet, the glory of God is another name for God's purpose in creating, and this 'is a question of no little complexity', as Fr Sutcliffe, S.J. says in the preface to his translation of the article 'The Purpose of the Creator and of Creatures' (Stanbrook Abbey Press, 1937) by Fr Stuffer, S.J. As he also points out, this question is fundamental in theology and in the spiritual life. Thus, an attempt to clarify our ideas on the subject appears to be by no means otiose. If, as a result, we throw any additional light on the question for others, or help to refresh their memories of some of its complexities, we shall consider our efforts amply rewarded.

THE END FOR WHICH WE WERE CREATED

DESMOND DONOVAN, S.J.

THE 'Foundation' of the *Spiritual Exercises* puts before us two basic terms, God the Creator, man the creature, and then states the relations that must exist between the two. There is more to man, however, than mere creation on the natural level. He has been elevated by baptism to the supernatural level, his nature has been transformed, and from this it follows that his relationship with God has also been changed. Before developing this aspect of the 'Foundation', the question of God's purpose in creation must first be answered.

Many theologians have asserted, following Lessius, that the end ultimately intended by God in creating the world was the finite communication of his goodness, or what is commonly known as his extrinsic glory. Lessius himself stated: 'And therefore in all his (God's) external operations he necessarily intends some good for himself. There is, however, no type of good imaginable which God could acquire for himself except his extrinsic glory, and amongst all goods external to God this extrinsic glory holds the first place. It is therefore impossible that God should do or will anything, and not at the same time intend his glory.' (De Perfectionibus Moribusque Divinis, L. 14, c. 3.). At the same time the supporters of this view assert that nothing created could have been the determining factor in God's creative act, and that his intrinsic perfection has remained unaltered throughout. This safeguards them from the criticism that on their view God would be in some way dependent on his creatures, but it does not safeguard them from the charge of illogicality; for God's extrinsic glory is a created thing, and cannot be his ultimate purpose in creation, as that would make the infinite dependent on the finite. The Council of Cologne, condemning Hermes, said:

In answer to the question, what moved God to create (the *finis operantis*), one should reply that God could not be moved by any motive distinct from himself; for, being self-sufficient, he cannot seek anything for himself. Moreover, since it is clear that God did create, and also that whatever he does, he does out of love for his own absolute goodness; we are right in saying that God was moved to create the world freely by his own goodness.

So much for God's purpose in creating; but what is to be said of the purpose or final goal of creation itself? When the Vatican Council defined that by natural reason alone man can come to know with certainty the existence of God, it used the following words: 'Eadem sancta Mater Ecclesia tenet ac docet Deum, rerum omnium principium et finem, naturali humanae rationis lumine e rebus creatis certo cognosci posse.' It is therefore an implicitly revealed truth that God himself is the end of creatures. That this must be so is apparent from a consideration of the Beatific Vision, which has been variously defined as the clear, immediate, intuitive knowledge of the divine essence. This knowledge or vision is a created thing, the highest finite manifestation of God's perfection, the fullest finite communication of his goodness. But it is not God. As finite, therefore, it demands an extrinsic efficient and final

cause, which can only be God himself, who utterly transcends his creation. When we ask, 'Why did God create the world?' we must seek the answer in the goodness of God, that infinite goodness which is so boundless that it freely overflows and communicates itself in the created works of God. All created things are in some measure the vessels of his perfection, radiating in their own finite way the illimitable splendour and glory of God; they are the utterance of a glory which eternally lacks nothing; the perfection of God himself is the very reason for their existence. The divine goodness is both the ultimate purpose of God in creation, and the ultimate goal of all things created: 'Quia bonus est, nos sumus', as St Augustine says.

All that men have and are is the gift of God's communication of his goodness. Men have been drawn out of nothing and given a share in the very perfection of God himself, given a radical orientation to God, such that not only in their being, but in their every action, they are dependent on the free gift of God. All that is attractive or lovable in creatures is so simply because it mirrors the infinite splendour of God, our one and only end and goal. All else is nothing, and can give no lasting satisfaction.

Yet men, by attaining their end, do not benefit God; when God creates, he receives nothing in return. 'He alone', said Avicenna, 'is truly liberal.' God is not seeking something from us; all he does is give, and he gives himself. Nor, for that matter, do evil and sin lessen the happiness of the Blessed Trinity: it can be said to offend God only in that by sin we act against our own good; we interpose our veto to the self-giving of God; we hurt only ourselves. God's plan is that we should be attracted to him and lose our hearts, detaching them from everything created. Thomas Merton's comment is worth repeating: 'His charity must not be represented as hunger. It is the banquet of the kingdom of heaven, to which many were invited by the great King. Many could not come to the banquet because they desired something beyond it, something for themselves—a farm, a wife, a yoke of oxen. They did not know that if they had sought first the banquet and the kingdom they would have received everything else besides.'

In creating us in his own image, however, God has not exhausted the fountain of his self-giving, for he has chosen to give us the supreme gift, a mysterious share in his own divine nature. Ours is a supernatural destiny, being 'filled with all the fulness of God' (Eph 3.19). Baptized into the death of Christ and made sharers of his resurrection, we have been joined to Christ, we have been made members of the body of him who is our sole mediator. Rendered powerless by sin to reach our goal, we have been born again, and once more made capable of realizing the end for which God created us, the sharing of his divine life. That which was lost has been given back to us in boundless measure. 'In giving Christ to us, has not God given us everything; the three divine persons to enjoy fully in heaven, men and angels as our companions on earth, all creation for our use . . . All things are ours, we are Christ's, and

Christ is God's' (S.T. In Rom. c. 8, 1. 6).

Christ is the sole agent of our transformation; through him we have passed from sin to life; in him we are sanctified by being gradually assimilated to him, until we reach his perfect likeness in heaven. 'And we all, with unveiled face, beholding the glory of the Lord, are being changed into his likeness from one degree of glory to another; for this comes from the Lord who is the Spirit' (2 Cor 3. 18). All this is free gift, free divine initiative: in creating man, God gave him all he is on the natural level; now he has done infinitely more, promising him a share in his own divine glory, proposing to him a love beyond man's natural powers, a share in the very love of God for himself.

As St Paul so often says, we have become 'a new creation', 'new men'; baptism has transported us into the sphere of the divine, where we live in God and for God. 'Wretched man that I am! Who will deliver me from this body of death? Thanks be to God, through Jesus Christ our Lord!' (Rom 7. 24-25). Once again we have been caught up into that vast circular motion of all created things coming out from God, united with Christ through the Incarnation, that all things may be brought back to God, their first beginning and last end.

This transformation is not a future state to which we look forward, it is an existing state of affairs here and now. There is no opposition between the life of the Christian in time and his glory in eternity; they are two facets of the same mystery. St Paul insists that the Christian's life is hidden in Christ; that he lives and moves in a new existence; that the world knows nothing of his new life; that when he sank under the baptismal waters, he disappeared, henceforth to live a hidden life in Christ. For the Christian one significant difference between time and eternity is that of manifestation of glory. When the Son of Man comes on the clouds of heaven our glory will shine forth; for the moment, it lies hidden. But it is ours, here and now, none the less; 'of his fulness we have all received, grace for grace'; we are blessed, St Peter tells us, because the Spirit of glory and the Spirit of God rests upon us. Heaven will bring but the perfection of this growth into glory, and the final drawing away of the veil which shrouds it from the world and from ourselves.

Having sketched briefly the outlines of God's plan of creation, it is now necessary to ask what response we are to make. St Ignatius replies that God created man to praise, reverence and serve. As members of Christ, our praise, reverence and service are nothing more than the living acknowledgement of our utter dependence on God, and that in Him, through our union with his Son, lies our ultimate happiness and perfection. 'We manifest our reverence for God, not for his sake, since he is infinite God to whom nothing can be added by our acts, but for ourselves, because in reverencing him our hearts are fixed on him, in whom alone our perfection consists' (S.T. 2/2, 81,7 corpus). Our service of God lies in our doing his will, receiving willingly the gift of his divine goodness. The alternative is to fall back on ourselves, seeking in our own

nothingness that happiness for which we were made, and which we can find only in God. We praise God by acknowledging his glory and radiant perfection, by submitting to it, by setting our affections on it, and by working for its greater manifestation in ourselves and in those around us. We have been made in the image of God, after his likeness, and through baptism we have been joined in a mysterious manner to his divine Son; this affinity requires that our boast be in God, and not in ourselves. 'How can you believe, who receive glory from one another and do not seek the glory that comes from the only God?' (Jn 5. 44).

For a man to act in this way calls for a true Christian detachment, a detachment that is not mere moral athleticism, nor pagan stoicism, for our aim is not simply to build up strong characters and firm wills. The detachment required of a Christian is not a negative thing; it is a cutting away from all created things precisely because we are growing into the glory of Christ. This growth inevitably demands detachment, but it is the man's detachment from childhood toys and youthful tastes, for Christ is fashioning in us a soul like his, with his desires, his sentiments, his values. Our sacrifices and self-denials only enrich us. It is not we who give anything to God; he gives, we always receive. Our weaning from attachment to earthly things is balanced by the reception of God into our hearts. This reception of God and detachment from things are the obverse and reverse of a single undertaking. No human detachment has any value at all except in relation to Christ's gift of himself to us; if our detachment is not accompanied by growth into Christ, it avails nothing.

Moreover, even in these acts of denial our action is the gift of God, without whom we are powerless; and our action is a response to a call which also comes from Him. Behind everything is God's love for us, leading us through Christ to our goal. It is the offer of himself and its acceptance on our part that are the basis of our Christian detachment. For this reason Christian detachment is not impoverishment, but enrichment.

Christ is the unique channel of our redemption, and he desires to share his divine life with all men. Our task is to receive it willingly. We have been made the sons of God, the seed of life divine has been planted in our hearts, our bodies are henceforward the members of Christ. We have risen with him, and must seek the things that are above, where he is seated at the right hand of God, the beginning of all things and their end. In the words of the baptismal ceremony: 'Enter into the Temple of God, that you may have a share with Christ in life eternal.'

(A fuller treatment of the ideas outlined in this article will be found in 'Dogmatic Foundations of the Spiritual Exercises' by P. J. Donnelly, S.J., Woodstock Letters, 83 (1954) 131 ; 'Meditation on the *Foundation* in the light of St Paul' by Jean Levie, S.J., Woodstock Letters, 84 (1955) 18 ; 'Doctrine of Grace in the Spiritual Exercises' by F. X. Lawlor, S.J., Theological Studies, 3 (1942) 513.)

FALLING SHORT OF GOD'S GLORY

EDWARD YARNOLD, S.J.

'All have sinned and fall short of the glory of God' (Rom 3. 23).

MAN was created to give glory to God. Sin is a refusal to pay God his tribute of glory. These considerations are helpful in meditating on sin in the First Week of the *Exercises*. The main purpose of this article is to discuss whether they can claim the support of St Paul in Rom 3. 23. Three ways will be suggested in which sin is a falling short of the glory of God, though it will be argued that the first of them is not the one St Paul had in mind. Incidentally it will be shown that all three ways are at least implicit in the meditations of the First Week. They might therefore commend themselves as the three points of a theological meditation on sin.

(1) Giving glory to God

The Jesuit who aspires to the greater glory of God does not, of course, hope to add to God's perfection, for his *internal* glory (the self-conscious splendour of his inner life) is independent of his creatures. But we may hope to increase God's *external* glory by displaying and reflecting his excellence through our existence and perfection (fundamental glory), and by giving loving expression to our recognition of his excellence (formal glory).

Now sin is a failure to pay God the external glory which is his due; and at first sight this seems to be the aspect of sin with which St Paul is concerned. Sin is not only a falling short of God's (external fundamental) glory, in so far as it stifles the praise which every soul in grace gives to God by the very fact of its life of grace; it is also a falling short of the opportunity of adding to God's (external formal) glory by the conscious witness of Christian life and worship. This is one of the ways in which my actions suffer 'deordination' (63). The 'Foundation' proposes the glory of God as the end of man's action: to reject this end is deordination and sin.

It is, however, unlikely that this is the meaning of Rom 3. 23: to extract this meaning from St Paul's statement one must take two words in an unnatural sense, 'glory' (*doxa*) and 'fall short' (*husterountai*).

Doxa

Doxa (glory) is the LXX translation of the Hebrew *kabod*, which is more fully discussed in Fr R. Murray's article in this number. Even in the OT the word describes not only manifestations of God's majesty (like the 'glory of the Lord' which filled the tabernacle: Ex 40. 34), but also human expressions of God's praise (e.g. Jer 13. 16: 'Give glory to the Lord your God'). Similarly in the NT the word can apply not only to the radiant splendour of Jesus at the Transfiguration (Lk 9. 32), but also to the praise or credit which we pay God: the Pharisees order the man born blind to 'give God the praise' (or credit, *doxan*: Jn 9. 24). This 'giving of glory', however, seems to be, not the giving to God of something he lacked, but the recognition of what he already has (cf. Kittel, II. 248. 10 & 251. 9). This is well illustrated by the description

of Herod's death in Acts 12. 23: the people honoured him as a god, and he was immediately struck down 'because he did not give God the glory', i.e., because he did not recognize and confess God's unique dignity. The Pharisees may have had a similar thought when they told the man born blind to give glory to God. They forbade him to 'confess' Jesus (acknowledge, *homologeîn*: Jn 9. 22), and required him to prove his orthodoxy by acknowledging God alone.

The NT doxologies confirm the view that giving God glory is simply a recognition. It is true that the verb is usually omitted, so that it is difficult to judge whether the sense is 'glory is to God' (recognition), or 'may God be given the glory' (which he would otherwise not have). The first of these two possibilities is the more likely, for in 1 Pet 4. 11 the verb is expressed and is in the indicative (*estin*: 'his is the glory'). Kittel reasonably believes this doxology to be representative of all.

We are God's glory

There are, however, some passages in the OT and NT in which man himself is said to be God's glory. The Lord told Jeremiah that he intended Israel and Judah to be 'for me a people, a name, a praise, and a glory' (13. 11). The corresponding verb 'glorify' (*doxazeîn*) expresses the same idea in Jesus' prayer before the Passion (Jn 17. 10): 'All mine are thine, and thine are mine, and I am glorified in them'.

Can this possibly be the sense of Rom 3. 23: 'All have sinned and so fail to be God's glory'? Unfortunately even this does not quite correspond to the meaning of *doxa* and *doxazô* in Jer 13 and Jn 17; for it requires us to take the noun *doxa*, not as the creature which by its perfection is part of God's external glory, but as the act or state of giving God the glory in this way. For this meaning of the word I can find no parallel. We must therefore seek another interpretation of Rom 3. 23.

Falling short

This first interpretation is defective on another count: it does violence to the verb 'fall short' (*hustereisthai*). It means literally 'to come late', and therefore 'to be excluded from', 'to be deficient' or 'to be inferior'. In the active it is used of those who 'fail to obtain the grace of God' (Heb 12. 15); St Paul uses it when he claims that 'I am not in the least inferior to these superlative apostles' (2 Cor 11. 5). It is also used in the active of the thing which is scarce, like the wine at Cana (Jn 2. 3). In the passive it frequently means 'to be in want', sometimes with the thing lacking expressed in the genitive (e.g. Ignatius, *Eph* 5. 2), but more frequently left unexpressed. Always in the passive (it is passive in Rom 3. 23) and almost always in the active, the verb means 'to be short of something for oneself'. Rom 3. 23 must therefore mean, not 'fail to give glory to God', but 'fail to have in themselves God's glory'.

(2) God's approval

So we come to the second interpretation of 'glory'. Does St Paul mean that sinners fail to win God's approval? This is certainly the sense of *doxa* in Jn 12. 43, where the authorities are afraid to admit their belief in Jesus, because 'they loved the praise (*doxan*) of men more than

the praise of God'. If this is what *doxa* means in Rom 3. 23, St Paul is saying that sinners forfeit God's approval. This interpretation fits the context well, for St Paul goes on to tell how sinners are 'justified' (*dikaïoumenoi*), a word which includes the sense of 'having God's approval'.

St Ignatius considers sin as the loss of God's approval when he tells the exercitant to imagine himself in the presence of a king whom he has grievously offended (74).

(3) Reflecting God's glory

However, this meaning of *doxa* is not common in the NT, and therefore the third interpretation is to be preferred. In the OT God's glory is the manifestation of his majesty to men. Moses is forbidden to watch while God's glory passes by (Ex 33. 22). Later, when Moses comes down from the mountain after speaking with God, his face is glorified (LXX *dedoxastai*, Ex 34. 29) in reflection of God's glory. In the fourth gospel and St Paul all the faithful reflect God's glory. In his last great prayer Jesus proclaims that he has given to those who believe in him the glory which the Father had given him, 'that they may be one' (Jn 17. 20-22). St Paul makes this glory one of the gifts to be received at the resurrection of the body: 'it is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory' (1 Cor 15. 43). Elsewhere in St Paul glory seems to belong to the faithful already. In 2 Cor 3 & 4 he compares the Old Law with the New. When Moses received the Old Law, the dispensation of death, his face shone with glory, but the Old Law, with its glory, passed away. The New Law is the dispensation of the Spirit and righteousness, and has a permanent glory (3. 11). The Jews have a veil over their hearts when they read the Old Law; we see without a veil God's glory reflected, and are 'changed into his likeness from one degree of glory to another' (3. 18). The same God who said 'Let there be light' has also 'shone in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Christ' (4. 6). If it is legitimate to take these remarks about glory together, we see that by faith in Christ, through the dispensation of the Spirit and righteousness, we receive the power of coming face to face with God's glory, and so even in this life come to reflect that glory and be transformed into it, and are thus united with Christ and with one another; but we shall not reflect God's glory fully until the next life.

Fr Murray's article traces the connection between this concept of glory and the *Shekinah*, and establishes that the word is used to express the indwelling of God in the soul. Such is the glory the sinner loses. It is also God's external glory, but that is not what St Paul is saying in Rom 3. 23. His point there is that God's glory is something the sinner loses for himself, but the loss is not just of God's approval. Glory is rather the quality in man which leads God to approve of him; but, conversely, God's approval is a condition of his shining in our hearts so that we reflect his glory.

St Ignatius develops a different imagery to describe what happens to the soul when it is changed from grace into malice (50). Sin is a 'corruption' (51); the sinner is to see himself 'as an ulcer and abscess

whence have issued so many sins . . . and such vile poison' (58).

Glory to God in the highest

The soul in grace, then, is the reflection of God's glory, and enjoys his approval. Both these ideas seem to be present in the angels' Christmas hymn (Lk 2. 14): 'Glory (*doxa*) to God in the highest, and on earth peace to men with whom he is pleased (*eudokias*)'. (Cf. 'Pax hominibus bonae voluntatis', by Fr R. Murray in *BC* 2 (1959) 26.) In 2 Cor 3, God's visible glory, reflected visibly in Moses, symbolizes man's union with God. In Lk 2, God's glory has shone over the shepherds, symbolizing perhaps the closer union of man with God which the Nativity makes possible. In the angels' hymn the counterpart of God's *doxa* is his *eudokia* for man. The fact that the two Greek words come from the same root emphasizes the correspondence. For God the Nativity is a manifestation of glory; for man it brings a reflection of that glory, peace (reconciliation?) and God's approval. (For the connection between glory, approval, peace and reconciliation cf. Rom 2. 10; 5. 1-11.) This fortunate state the sinner forfeits.

THE KING OF GLORY

BRYAN O'REILLY, S.J.

Who is the King of glory?
The Lord, strong and mighty,
The Lord, mighty in battle.
Lift up your heads, O gates,
And be lifted up, O ancient doors,
That the King of glory may come in. (Ps 24)

IS God's glory hidden? The minds of men helped by their maker grapple with its mystery. But the heart of man and the soul of man are able to share that glory, and take part in its reality. It is while we are lost in the thought of God, trying to talk with God, wanting to walk with God, that the King of glory shows us and shares with us some of his glory. In the *Spiritual Exercises* of St Ignatius the gates of our soul are swung open to give entry to the King of glory. Memory, understanding and will open for his coming. And in the great meditation on the life of the eternal King, his glory is sought and his glory is found. Only in heaven will we know of its full splendour, but already on earth we take part in its wonder. The knowledge, the love and the life of God are God's glory as shown to man. The reception of the overwhelming goodness of God poured out in creation and the realization of that goodness are a reflection of the glory of God. It is not enough, however, to seek God's glory in mere thoughts. Not in words, but in the Word, we see God's glory:

The Word was made flesh and came to dwell among us; and we have sight of his glory, glory such as belongs to the Father's only begotten Son, full of grace and truth (Jn 1. 14).

A son who is the radiance of his Father's splendour, and the full expression of his being (Heb 1. 3).

God is the last end of all things, the first beginning of all things; and it befitted his majesty that in summoning all those sons of his to glory, he should crown with suffering the life of that Prince who was to lead them into salvation (Heb 2. 10).

The sons of God are called to glory, to share in a special way the glory of God; a glory which shines out on man, which flashes the splendour of God in heaven to his sons on earth. The meaning of God's glory is not spelt out for us in human language; it is found in the life and love of a divine Person. And in a strange and wonderful way we are able to share that love and life; but only if we find and follow that divine Person, Jesus Christ. In the Person of Jesus Christ the glory of God is made known. By the full dedication of our lives to Christ, by living in Christ's life, we share in our human way something of the glory of God.

The heading of St Ignatius' great meditation on the King of glory is sometimes missed: 'The call of the temporal king helps to contemplate the life of the eternal King.' (91). So like us in human ways Christ comes to lift us up into a life that is divine. Christ is the centre, the heart, of the meditation on the kingdom. The soul seeks to be dazzled and almost hypnotized by the 'Son who is the radiance of the Father's splendour' (Heb 1. 3), to be delighted by the human understanding and sympathy of Christ for men, to be drawn by the love of Christ, to be dedicated to his service, 'to ask from our Lord the grace that I may not be deaf to his call, but prompt and diligent to accomplish his most holy will' (91).

There is something in the beginning of this meditation by St Ignatius that annoys many. Why the parable of the earthly king? Its lack of reality hardly helps to bring us to the reality of the risen Christ. There is however something far deeper in Ignatius' approach. Before centring our thoughts on Christ the King, who is both human and divine, Ignatius mentions the merely human. The attraction to a human person, the admiration of natural human virtues, the honest loyalty of a human heart and will towards a fellow human being, are presented to us. If a man is not capable of this, how can he love and follow close to Christ who is human as well as divine? It seems hardly conceivable in the ordinary run of affairs that a soul lacking in admiration and appreciation of things human should be lifted up into things divine.

His nature is from the first divine and yet he did not see in the rank of godhead a prize to be coveted; he dispossessed himself and took the nature of a slave, fashioned in the likeness of men, and presenting himself to us in human form (Phil 2. 6-7).

Christ talked with men and walked with men on earth. The Person of Christ is real in history, real in humanity, real now in risen form in heaven. And he still talks to men and walks with men and offers men a sharing in his life — the life of the eternal King, eternal life. The risen Christ still makes his appeal to men. Within their hearts while kneeling at prayer men will come to him, and he will come to them: 'how much more worthy of consideration is it to see Christ our Lord, the eternal King, and before him the whole world, all of whom and each in particular he calls!' (95)

We have seen how Ignatius shows us human love and loyalty at the start of his meditation. But he to whom our hearts go out is not only human but divine. And Christ invites us to share his life, his divine life. In the meditation on the Kingdom (93) the offer of food, drink and

clothing is made by the earthly king. The King of glory offers us his flesh to eat, his blood to drink, his grace -- his life and love -- to clothe us. The bounty and goodness of God is shown us through the Word Incarnate. And sinful man is called to the Word made flesh. A hammer blow was struck at pride in the First Week. Now Ignatius wishes to put a man on his mettle: whatever metal man is made of, the burning love and life of Christ must make it red-hot, so that it glows with the same love and life. All is now directed to Christ, true God, true Man, the King of glory. Certainly in the First Week of the *Exercises* Ignatius reminds us of Christ as Creator, Lord, our intercessor with the Father. But in the First Week we have striven to break away from self-centredness and sin. In the overture of the Second Week it is the thought of being Christ-centred and Christlike that dominates. The great drum-call to Christian love and life in Christ is sounded out in the Kingdom meditation. 'Christ is your life, and when he is made manifest, you too will be made manifest in glory with him' (Col. 3. 4).

The strong personal devotion to Christ which is sought in this meditation must not be thought of as a narrow, individualistic piety. It is in Christ, with Christ, that all glory is given to the Father, and so we must come to Christ. But Christ's mission must become ours -- to bring all sinners to life in him.

My will is to conquer the whole world, and all enemies, and thus to enter into the glory of my Father (95).

With Christ all will be brought to life . . . Christ is the first-fruits, and after him follow those who belong to him . . . his reign as we know it must continue until he has put all his enemies under his feet (1 Cor 15. 23-25).

But why does Ignatius seem to take away so much of the majesty and grandeur of this meditation by introducing such a strong note of mortification? At the beginning of the meditation Ignatius shows us the beauty of human loyalty and love. But he does not forget that there lingers on in man a hurt that must be healed. Love and loyalty would tend to gravitate towards self and sin, if not restrained by some attempt to halt self-love and greed. To despise the praise of men by seeking the approval of God will often mean bearing the insults of men. To care nothing for the riches of men, but to want only the richness of God, will frequently entail the experience of real poverty. Those striving in the service of Christ will show devotion by

also acting against their own sensuality and their carnal and worldly love (97) . . . in bearing all insults and reproaches, and all poverty, as well as actual poverty as poverty of spirit (98).

Persecution does not leave us unbefriended, nor crushing blows destroy us; we carry about continually in our bodies the dying state of Jesus, so that the living power of Jesus may be manifest in our bodies too (1 Cor 4. 10).

The grandeur of being in the service of Christ will not always be apparent. Fine feelings must not be the measure of our love and loyalty. Ignatius brings us down to earth and makes us remember that we are men of earth. Though working for all men in Christ it will sometime be as if we were alone; the inner struggles of the heart, the silent bite of poverty, the unkind cuts from critics. Thrown back on self we realize the need of God. And as we keep with God we learn to live the life of

God: God made man for us. The individual soul seeking to be united with Christ will, when one with Christ, work in him to bring all men to Christ.

The same God who bade light shine out of darkness has kindled a light in our hearts, whose shining is to make known his glory as he has revealed it in the features of Jesus Christ (2 Cor 4. 6).

We have a treasure then in our keeping, but its shell is perishable earthenware: it must be God and not anything in ourselves that gives it its sovereign power (2 Cor 4. 7).

It is no effervescent battle-cry we are asked to make. A wrong enthusiasm, that lacks reality, will not bring much glory with it. It is how we give and how we live that matters. In Christ we live, in Christ we give God glory. We admire and love human things, remembering they are not perfect except where human joins divine. The divine Majesty himself lifts us up into his life. It is his Majesty that summons all those sons of his to glory. 'Eternal Lord of all things, I make my oblation with thy favour and help, in the presence of thy infinite goodness, and in the sight of thy glorious Mother and all the saints.' (98) It is God's good pleasure that we seek. In God's good time we shall see his glory open out before us, and we ourselves shall have our share in it in Christ:

Power was given him, and glory, and sovereignty; obey him all must, men of every race and tribe and tongue, such a reign as his lasts for ever, such power as his the ages cannot diminish (Dan 7. 14).

FELIX CULPA

ANTHONY FORRESTER, S.J.

In a previous article of this number sin was considered as a falling short of God's glory: 'All have sinned and fall short of the glory of God.' (Rom 3.23) Although St Paul is considering here the consequences of sin as they affect man, the expression he uses describes very appropriately the most fundamental element in sin: the decrease of God's external glory. This decrease is all the more outrageous because it is on a grand scale: 'All have sinned . . .' Even though not all men have sinned personally, all have sinned in Adam. But God, in his mercy has remedied this situation: 'He has delivered us from the dominion of darkness and transferred us to the kingdom of his beloved Son, in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins.' (Col 1. 13-14) Once more man is able to give God the glory that is his due. However, the question then arises: was this plan of redemption only a makeshift, a second-best? Surely there must be an everlasting regret about Adam's sin; it would have been better if it had never been committed. Why, then, did God permit it? By creating different parents for the human race, who were destined not to sin, he could have prevented this diminution of his glory. Can redeemed man give as much glory to God as unfallen man?

The Church in her liturgy makes a bold answer. In the hymn of praise of the Paschal Candle she sings: 'O felix culpa quae talem ac tantum meruit habere Redemptorem!' Could optimism be carried

further? In this section of the *Exultet* the Church appears to be considering primarily the benefit which God has conferred on man, and to be implying that this benefit is even greater than the gift of original justice. But there is no real distinction between God's gifts to man and his external glory (cf. the article 'The End for which we were Created'). To put the matter in another way: Christ gives greater glory to God by redeeming us than Adam and his posterity would have given by not sinning. Understood in this sense the Church's cry may appear to be only a rhetorical version of St Paul's explanation: 'God has consigned all men to disobedience, that he may have mercy upon all.' (Rom 11. 32) God permitted the human race to fall that he might make a greater display of mercy.

The Second Adam

However, this section of the *Exultet* is not simply a eulogy of the divine mercy; it is a cry of wonder at the way God showed mercy: 'O inestimabilis dilectio caritatis: ut servum redimeres. Filium tradidisti!' The Church exults, not only in the forgiveness her members have received, but also in the gift of such a mighty Redeemer, 'talem ac tantum Redemptorem'. By his very entry into the world this Redeemer has increased God's glory immeasurably, for no creature can give glory to God comparable with that given by the sacred Humanity of Our Lord. This is the natural interpretation of the sentence: 'O felix culpa . . .' The sentence immediately preceding confirms this interpretation: 'O certe necessarium Adae peccatum, quod Christi morte deletum est!' If *necessarium* is to be understood literally (there is no adequate reason for excluding this sense), then the sentence must mean that Adam's sin was a necessary condition of the Incarnation. To say that the Fall was a necessary condition of the Redemption as such would be somewhat banal. A critic may object that *necessarium* is equivalent to *conveniens* (although the equivalence is unwarranted linguistically); so that the meaning would then be: Adam's sin was 'convenient' because it fitted in perfectly to a scheme in which God's mercy would be strikingly manifested. Some such interpretation is required for those who hold that God would have become Man, even if there had been no sin. Thus Adam's sin would not be a cause or condition of the Incarnation, but only of the role the Messiah would fill: he would appear, not as the king of glory, but as the suffering servant. Although a liturgical chant is not to be accorded the same weight as a text of Scripture or a conciliar definition, nevertheless it is significant that this alternative view of the Incarnation leads to an unsatisfactory interpretation of this section of the *Exultet*. There is no special *convenientia* about Christ's death; that could never be desired for its own sake. If, however, the operative word is *Christi*, then the need for making *necessarium* equivalent to *conveniens* disappears; for the meaning would then be: Adam's sin was a fortunate, indeed a necessary event because, had it not taken place, there would have been no Second Adam. Instead of expressing bitterness towards our first parent, the Church thanks him for fulfilling the condition upon which the human race was to receive a new and

infinitely superior Head. 'It was the purpose of his good pleasure in him . . . to bring all things to a head in Christ, both the things in the heavens and the things upon the earth.' (Eph. 1. 10 - WV)

Medieval misgivings and papal approval

In the 10th century the section 'O vere necessarium Adae peccatum . . . Redemptorem' was cut out of the *Exultet* in some parts of the Church, notably of the version inserted in the *Ordo Romanus* of the Pontifical of Mainz. To call Adam's sin necessary seems to have been too shocking for some of the faithful, or at least for some of the clergy. However, in a revision of the Curial liturgy Innocent III decided to keep this section, or to introduce it (if it was not by his time already in the Roman Pontifical). In this instance, then, the *lex orandi* has positive papal approbation.

Although the Church has made no official doctrinal pronouncement which excludes other reasons for the Incarnation, it is legitimate to suppose that she has assigned an adequate, if not the principal, cause in the Nicene Creed: 'who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven.' No one denies that God could have become man irrespective of sin; the question so vigorously disputed since the 13th century is: in the divine predestination is the Incarnation *ante* or *post praevisum lapsum Adami*? Apropos of this very question St Thomas reminds us: 'Everything that depends exclusively on the will of God, and to which the creature has no right, can be known to us only to the extent we are informed of it by Holy Scripture, because it is through the Scripture that the divine will is manifested to us.' (S.T. 3.1.3 corpus)

Scripture

There is no statement in Scripture which says explicitly that there would have been no Incarnation had there been no sin. But several texts give the Redemption as the reason for the Incarnation, and it would be strange if the only reason mentioned in Scripture clearly and constantly were not the principal reason. It is equally strange that other reasons, if they were sufficient, should be passed over in silence. The following texts are typical:

even as the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life a ransom for many. (Mt 20. 28)

For God sent the Son into the world, not to condemn the world, but that the world might be saved through him. (Jn 3. 17)

In this is love, not that we loved God but that he loved us and sent his Son to be the expiation for our sins. (1 Jn 4. 10)

The saying is sure and worthy of full acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners. (1 Tim 1. 15)

Hence St Thomas concludes: 'Since throughout the Scriptures the reason given for the Incarnation is the sin of the first man, it is preferable to say that the work of the Incarnation was ordained by God as a remedy for sin, in such a way that, were it not for sin, there would have been no Incarnation.' (S.T. 3.1.3 corpus)

The Fathers

His teaching finds abundant support in the Fathers. St Athanasius wrote: 'It was our sorry case that caused the Word to come down, our

transgression that called out his love for us, so that he made haste to help us and to appear among us.' (De Incarnatione, 1. 4) St Augustine: 'If man had not fallen, the Son of Man would not have come.' (Sermons, 174. 2. 2) St Cyril of Alexandria: 'If we had not sinned, he would not have become like us; and if he had not become like us he would not have endured the Cross.' (Dialogus de Trinitate, 5; PG 75. 968) St Leo: 'If man, made in the image and likeness of God, had remained in the honourable state of his nature . . . the Creator of the world would not have become a creature.' (Sermons, 77. 2) The most striking parallels to the sentiments expressed in the *Exultet* are to be found in the works of St Ambrose. Indeed, these parallels are so striking that Dom Bernard Capelle in an article, 'L'Exultet pascal, oeuvre de saint Ambroise', *Studi e Testi* 121 (1946) 219, has argued that they provide satisfactory confirmation of the statements made by Honorius of Autun and Durandus of Mende that St Ambrose composed the *Exultet*. Three texts from his writings show even verbal correspondence with this section of the *Exultet*.

Exultet: Nihil enim nobis nasci profuit nisi redimi profuisset.

Ambrose: Non prodesset nasci nisi redimi profuisset. (In Luc. 2. 41-42)

Exultet: O felix culpa quae talem ac tantum meruit habere Redemptorem.

Ambrose: Sciebat Adam esse casurum ut redimeretur. Felix ruina quae reparatur in melius. (In Ps 39. 20)

Facta est mihi culpa mea merces redemptionis, per quam mihi Christus advenit . . . Fructuosior culpa quam innocentia (De Jacob, 1. 21)

The Spiritual Exercises

In the *Exercises* St Ignatius presents the Incarnation as a prelude to the Redemption. He tells the exercitant to contemplate 'how the Three Divine Persons beheld all the surface and circuit of the terrestrial globe, covered with men. And how seeing all men descending into Hell, They determined, in Their eternity, that the Second Person should become Man to save the human race . . .' (102) Later in the meditation we are to consider what the various persons are saying: 'Likewise what the Three Divine Persons are saying, viz: "Let us work out the Redemption of the human race."' (107) Such a view naturally suggests itself as the development of the ideas of the First Week. Sin is the great obstacle to the increase of God's glory. But we cannot in a Pelagian spirit of moral rearmament decide to abandon sin and make good overnight. Nor is it enough to have Christ as a model. He is first and foremost our Redeemer. The fruit we are to pray for in this meditation is 'an interior knowledge of our Lord, Who for me is made Man, that I the more love Him and follow Him' (104). Yet, we had first to be freed from the domination of sin before we could follow Our Lord, before we could 'walk in newness of life.' (Rom 6. 4) 'For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set me free from the law of sin and death.' (Rom 8. 2) Thus Adam's sin was the condition, not only of the greater glory which Christ gave to God, but also of the glory we can give to God by imitating Christ. 'For those whom he foreknew he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son, in order that he might be the first-born among many brethren. And those whom he predestined he also called;

and those whom he called he also justified; and those whom he justified he also glorified.' (Rom 8. 29-30)

The conclusion to be drawn from this consideration is not that the original sin was a good thing, and therefore matter for rejoicing. Of this sin Dame Julian of Norwich wrote: 'And to this our blessed Lord answered full meekly . . . and shewed that Adam's sin was the most harm that ever was done, or ever shall be into the world's end.' (*Revelations of Divine Love*, 29) When the Church calls it *felix culpa* she is expressing rhetorically the essential optimism of Christianity: even the greatest evil, sin, cannot in the long run stem the outpouring of the divine goodness. Indeed, the wisdom and mercy of God are such that the greatest sin of man has been the occasion of a greater manifestation of God's glory. Hence Dame Julian continues in the same passage: 'Furthermore, he learned that I should behold the glorious asseethe (satisfaction); for this asseeth-making is more pleasing to the blessed God-head, and more worshipful for man's salvation without comparison, than ever was the sin of Adam's harmful.'

REGNAVIT A LIGNO DEUS

MICHAEL O'HALLORAN, S.J.

WHEN the exercitant comes to the Third Week of the *Spiritual Exercises*, he has just made his Election. He has passed in review the circumstances of his life so as seriously and fervently to choose the course which will best lead him to his final end, 'in all and through all neither wishing nor seeking anything else except the greater praise and glory of God our Lord' (189). He is therefore a man full of zeal for the glory of God, a glory which he will seek in his outer life of action and in his inner life of prayer, modelling himself as far as he can on the example of Christ.

Saint Ignatius now instructs him to contemplate Our Lord in all the circumstances of his Passion and Death, and the fruits to be gained from these considerations are made quite clear. Thus, in the 3rd Prelude of the 1st Contemplation the recommendation is 'to ask for that which I want: here it will be to feel sorrow, affliction, and confusion because for my sins Our Lord is going to His Passion' (193). The climate is one of sorrow for Christ's sufferings and of compunction for the sins which have provoked them, so that recommendations to grief and sorrow are repeated in the 4th, 5th and 6th Points. In the same way, the 2nd and 6th of the General Additions are to be harmonized with this search for sorrow: ' . . . not to endeavour to admit joyful thoughts, even though good and holy, as on the Resurrection and of Paradise, but rather exciting myself to sorrow, pain and anguish . . . ' (206). Saint Ignatius wants the exercitant really to feel the Passion of Christ. He would be moved to tears at the sight of one of his dear ones being tortured and killed unjustly for his sake and through his fault, and that is the kind of sorrow for which he is instructed to ask.

It may well seem to the exercitant that there is some contradiction

here. On the one hand, Saint Ignatius has led him on to make an election in which he has as never before pledged himself utterly to seek in everything the glory of God; on the other, he is now plunging into a series of meditations, whose first fruit is to be grief and tears.

Does this mean that Saint Ignatius means to exclude the glory of God from the Third Week, steeping the exercitant in the cold, hard facts of the Passion before allowing him to go on to the warmth of glory that lies beyond them? How otherwise could it be right to give oneself over to tears and sorrow?—for how could one possibly pray in order to bewail the glory of God, or something that is actively achieving it? These thoughts would lead the exercitant to look upon the Third Week primarily as a period of repentance, reminding him of what he is really like, of what his sins have done, and reminding him too of the reality of Christ's sufferings, in case they should be overshadowed by the coming Resurrection. In this scheme of things, the Passion itself and the Crucifixion would be acts of obedient humiliation having nothing glorious about them, although leading to the eventual glorification of Christ.

In order to solve these doubts and to discover whether or not this view of the Third Week best corresponds to the mind of Saint Ignatius, there are two questions to be considered: first, whether God's glory is actually present in the Passion and Death of Christ; second, whether the answer to this first question fits coherently into the plan of the *Exercises*. We intend to show here how Saint John presents the Passion and Cross as positive glorifications of Christ; and then how this doctrine will serve the exercitant well in his determination to promote God's glory in all things.

Saint John's doctrine of the glory of Christ differs both from that of the Synoptics and from that of Saint Paul. For the Synoptics, apart from the brief interlude of the Transfiguration recorded in all three, Christ's glory is centred about his second coming (Mt. 16.27; 19.28; etc.); it is real enough, but essentially of the future. For Saint Paul, broadly speaking, Christ's glory comes with his Resurrection from the voluntary shame of the Cross (Phil. 2.8); here, Christ's glory is indeed to be seen on earth, but only after the Resurrection. Saint John, however, presents the glory of Christ as visible to our faith from the very Incarnation, onwards through the successive wonders of the Public Life, and up to the heights of Calvary. All this is one great doxology, a swelling chorus heralded over Bethlehem, and culminating in the fact of Christ's triumphant death on the Cross, lifted up indeed, exalted in every sense, and drawing mankind to the focal point of history.

Saint John frequently speaks of Christ's glory in his Gospel, now it is in the sense of extrinsic honour shown by or due from men, now in the sense of the intrinsic splendour of the Divinity. However, there are three texts where these two meanings of glory coincide. All of them were spoken by Christ himself when he was at the brink of the Passion, and so they have a particular relevance to this discussion (1).

The first of these passages (12.20-32) tells how Philip and Andrew

asked Our Lord to come and make himself known to the Gentiles, and how he replied that the time of his glorification was *now* at hand. Anyone who would follow him must take his example, just like the seed falling into the ground apparently dead, disappearing from sight before burgeoning into a life more fruitful than ever before. Our Lord stresses that his hour of trial is *even now* upon him, asking for and receiving confirmation from Heaven. In his answer the Father says that he has glorified his name by all his works and wonders, and promises to do so again. Something is about to happen which will give great glory to God in the same way as the previous events of Christ's life.

The nearer Our Lord comes to the betrayal, the more often this theme recurs. Thus the opening words of the farewell discourse (13.31-32) are spoken, as it were, in relief at the ending of the tension, for Judas has just gone out to betray his Master. For the second time Christ speaks of an imminent event which will give great glory to God, but now he includes his own glorification, and not just as something to come, but as a process already begun. Judas is naming his price, the Passion is certain to take place, so '*Now is the Son of Man glorified . . .*'

Similarly, the end of the discourse is full of yearning for the glory of God about to be achieved (17.5-6); then Our Lord begins the great Sacerdotal Prayer, a plea for the unity and fidelity of the Church which is to continue God's work upon earth. Our Lord sees that his sacrifice is about to give God supreme glory on Calvary, a glory which the Holy Spirit will confirm among men, upon whose altars it will be re-enacted until the end of time.

In these three passages Our Lord speaks, just before the Passion, of a glorious event which is at hand. He is to redeem the world by his Passion and Death, and then he is to rise again. There can be no doubt about the glorious nature of the Resurrection, but are we justified in applying Our Lord's words to the Passion as well? It is clear that Christ's sufferings can be called glorious in that they are the supreme achievement of loving obedience to the will of the Father; we know, too, what the Passion means in terms of redemption for fallen man. In addition, the death of the Cross is positively glorious in that it has the nature of a triumph, and it is the more glorious for its apparent lack of glory.

This paradox is explained by Saint John. He tells us that the people were puzzled when God spoke from heaven in reply to Our Lord's prayer that he should make himself known, attributing the sound either to an angel or to the noise of thunder. Then Our Lord told them clearly that the Devil's final overthrow was to begin simultaneously with the glorification of the Passion (12.31). '*Now is the judgement of the world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out.*' It is quite wrong to think of the Resurrection as a surprise for Satan, exultant at hounding to death the Son of God. This view misses the point of Our Lord's unique triumph.

Could there be a greater victory than that by which all the consequences of sin were freely embraced and turned to the service and

glory of God? With his swords of distress and despair wrested from him, Satan had now nothing on which he could rely. Even death had deserted him, for this Man had died only to live again and to bring new life to his brother-men. Satan found himself beaten by one who knew how to turn everything to the glory of God.

The sufferings of the Passion could not have been forced on Our Lord from outside: 'Oblatus est quia Ipse voluit, et peccata nostra Ipse portavit.' (Lauds, Maundy Thursday). Our Lord chose to accept his death and the way in which it should be inflicted upon him, for this was to be his way of identifying himself utterly with the divine will. Saint John puts this most strikingly in another place (1 John.4.10), where he says that God sent Christ 'to be a propitiation for our sins.' The phrase defies comparison with any accepted usage, but it has been pointed out that there is a certain analogy in the way we speak of the Battle of Britain as Britain's finest hour (2).

None of us who lived through that time can forget the ruinous suffering that it brought; yet at the same time we can recall the exhilaration that somehow transformed the men and women and children around us. No sane man could glory in the destruction of house and home, but at the same time no man could fail to see the dignity and dedication that all that courage brought to those who suffered it. We may have wept at the time, as Saint John may have done on Calvary; we may weep still at the memory, as Saint Ignatius recommends us in these contemplations; but these tears detract in no way from the glory we remember. This is in some sort the way in which Saint John sees the glory of the Cross.

Our Lord's routing of sin, death and every aspect of Satan's power over mankind was achieved by the Cross; this is the glory of Calvary. We must now see how it can help the exercitant in his quest for God's glory in all that he does. What our Lord did in the Passion was to take the most unpromising material and make it into a means of giving glory to the Father. Betrayal, injustice, ingratitude, pain and death can all be accepted as suitable offerings to God, because Christ himself has given us the example.

This consideration has brought a message of hope and courage into the Church from the earliest times. Saint Athanasius, for example, writes as follows in the *De Incarnatione*, ch. 27:

Death has become like a tyrant who has been completely conquered by the legitimate monarch; bound hand and foot the passers-by jeer at him, hitting him and abusing him, no longer afraid of his cruelty and rage, because of the king who has conquered him. So has death been conquered and branded for what it is by the Saviour on the Cross. It is bound hand and foot, all who are in Christ trample it as they pass and as witnesses to him deride it, scoffing and saying, 'O death, where is thy victory? O grave, where is thy sting?'

Similarly, Christ's turning to the purpose of redemption the physical sufferings and utter humiliation of his Passion, has always brought strength and comfort to those who need them most. It is not that Our Lord has managed to come through unscathed, but precisely the opposite, that his wounds and sorrows and sacrifice are now part of his

glorified divine Person, just as inevitably troubles and distress will be part of any human person.

All this is the familiar doctrine of the 11th Rule of our Summary, and for the exercitant it echoes the generous colloquy of the Two Standards, when he prayed to Our Lady, 'to obtain for me grace from her Son and Lord that I may be received under his Standard . . . in bearing reproaches and insults, the better to imitate Him in these, provided only I can endure them without sin on the part of any person, or displeasure to His Divine Majesty' (147). Stoicism has already given way to positive Christian patience, and now that mortification is to receive its perfection in the exact imitation of Christ. Again, this is nothing but the 3rd Degree of Humility, which has already been considered and prayed over, but which has perhaps been bracketed off from everyday life as something to be reserved for extraordinary circumstances, which might never come into the life of an average man.

Now, however, the exercitant has the key to a daily imitation of Christ in which everything, except what is sinful, can be considered in terms of the glory of God. Just as the Cross with all its anguish and dereliction was the sign of Christ's victory, so the sufferings and anxieties of this life can be accepted with joy as well as resignation. These trials, exactly as they are, can help the sufferer, exactly as he is, to praise and serve God. There is no need to wait for a better time or for a brighter prospect. Saint Augustine, commenting on Psalm 70, makes this point when he speaks of the soul seeking security from the trials of this world: 'What shall I say?' he concludes. 'Did one come to show thee the way? There came to thee the Way itself' (3). In suffering, as in all other things, Christ has gone before us on our way to the Father. He has become our way, a way that is also truth, opposed to the falseness of sin, and life, opposed to the darkness of death.

If the exercitant approaches the meditations of the Third Week with these thoughts in his mind, he will surely find there enough, and more than enough, to nourish his yearning for God's glory and to deepen his grasp of what that glory really means. After meditating the Gospel of Saint John, he will be able to make his own these words of Saint John's own martyred disciple, Saint Polycarp:

Unceasingly then, let us cling to our Hope, and the pledge of our justification, that is, Christ Jesus, who in his own body took the weight of our sins up to the Cross; who did no wrong; nor was treachery found on his lips. On the contrary, for our sakes, that we might live in him, he endured everything. Therefore let us become imitators of his patient endurance, and glorify him whenever we suffer for the sake of his Name. This is the example he has set us in his own Person, and this is what we have learnt to believe (4).

Notes :

- (1) Cf. W. Grossouw, 'La Glorification du Christ dans le quatrième évangile' in 'L'Evangile de Jean', Louvain, 1958.
- (2) This is touched upon by Vincent Taylor in 'The Cross of Christ', London, 1956, p. 69.
- (3) In Ps 70, Serm ii. 3. Cf. E. Przywara, S.J., 'An Augustine Synthesis', London, 1936, p. 199.
- (4) St Polycarp, 'Letter to the Philippians' in 'Ancient Christian Writers', Vol. 6, p. 79.

THE PLACE WHERE THY GLORY DWELLS

The divine indwelling in the Old and New Testaments

ROBERT MURRAY, S.J.

ISRAEL was different from all her neighbours in that she understood her God to be invisible, one who could not, and therefore must not, be represented in any material medium. He was Yahweh, he who makes things to be; the personal God who called Abraham and all his descendants into a personal relationship with himself; tangible in his creation but in himself utterly transcending every approach by human senses. Yet there is this paradox in the expressions of ancient Hebrew religious experience: the most spiritual revelations of God's dealings with men are also the most anthropomorphic. God could not use any other than human language; anything less would have been less than personal. Thus it comes about that the language of the experience of God centres round words which are essential to the expression or revelation of human personality and dignity. The chief words in question are *panim*, face, connoting personal presence; *shem*, name, that which gives access to the person, and *kabod*, glory.

The use of the last word reflects the Semitic character of Biblical culture. The root KBD connotes heaviness (*kabed* means the liver). *Kabod* means weight, wealth, importance; it belongs to the world of nomads rich in flocks, of dignified elders sitting in the city gateway and of warriors returning in triumph. To God, however, the word seems to have been applied first less by the ascription of royal splendour than because of the overwhelming grandeur of natural phenomena, of which he was recognized to be the cause.

The heavens shew forth the glory of God :

and the firmament proclaims his handiwork. (Ps 19. 1; Vg 18. 1)

The voice of Yahweh is upon the waters :

the God of glory thunders : . . .

the voice of Yahweh is full of majesty (Ps 29. 3-4; Vg 28)

The use of *kabod* often suggests that we are not far from the imagery of the thunderstorm (cf. Ex 19. 18). This would explain how the word came to develop a connotation of splendour and light; this is primary in 'glory' for us, but seems not to be so in Hebrew. Finally, as the word came to be a special vehicle for expressing something of God, it easily connoted moral dignity, beauty, perfection and in short all that calls for adoration. In this connection the account of the great theophany on Sinai should be read (Ex 33.17-34.8). God has encouraged Moses by confiding and friendly treatment (33.17), so that Moses asks to see God's glory. God replies that he will make the most intimate revelation that is possible, but Moses cannot see his face; it would be unbearable, and so God must protect Moses from seeing it. The passage is an extreme case of that paradoxical combination of the anthropomorphic and the transcendent.

The 'glory,' which thus appears to refer somehow to God in himself, was understood to be in the heart of the cloud which had led the Israelites from Egypt (Ex 13.21-22) and which dwelt upon the summit

of Sinai when Moses went up to receive the renewed Covenant (Ex 19.16ff). It is certainly against this background that the Synoptic writers intend the accounts of the Transfiguration to be understood.

The Glory in the Tabernacle and the Temple

As the Mosaic tradition develops, the cloud and the Glory within it are described as overshadowing the Tabernacle in the 'tent of meeting' where God had promised to meet the Children of Israel and make his Glory dwell (Ex 29.43-46). The closing verses of Exodus (40.34-38) describe the beginning of this localized indwelling of God. It is clear from the directions for the sacred furniture that God's presence was seen as localized even more particularly, above the Propitiatory or Mercy-seat which was upon the Ark of the Covenant (Ex 25.22), the sacred record of Israel's personal bond with Yahweh. It was the corollary of the fact of this bond that he should be thought of as personally dwelling (ShKN, dwell) in the Tabernacle (*mishkan*, dwelling-place). The classic formulation of the Covenant-promise comes to link the two aspects of personal alliance and of indwelling (e.g. Lev 26.11-12; cf Apoc 21.3). When the Temple of Solomon was consecrated, as related in 1 Kgs 8.10-11, the cloud and Glory came to dwell there in just the same way and with the same effect, that the priests could not stand to do their work. It was thus the firm faith of Israel, at least as expressed in the documents in their final form, that the presence of God in the former Temple was guaranteed by this visible, if unbearable, splendour. Many psalms celebrate the indwelling Glory:

O Lord, I love the habitation of thy house,
and the place where thy glory dwells (Ps 26.8; Vg 25).

For the Lord has chosen Sion,
He has desired it for his habitation:

'This is my resting-place for ever;

Here will I dwell, for I have desired it' (Ps 132.13-14; Vg 131).

Two prophetic visions reveal what a divinely inspired eye might see of the Glory. Isaiah, writing in the time of the old Temple (736 B.C.), describes the Lord enthroned like a king in the Temple (Is 6.1-4). The imagery is drawn both from royal splendour and from thunder. Ezekiel, a priest, contemporary with the exile, sees his (evidently indescribable) vision of God as a manifestation of the Glory (Ez 1.4ff etc.); in vision he sees the Glory abandoning the Temple at its fall (10.18), and the climax of his vision of the ideal restored Temple is the return of the Glory from the east to take up its habitation once more (43.2-5).

The restored Temple was a modest building, but hopes were high that God would dwell there as of old. This is expressed in Haggai 2.3-9, where, though there is stress on material splendour, the word used is *kabod*, and in the contemporary Psalm 85.9 (Vg 84). However, as the Mishna testifies (*Yoma*, 9b-10a), the post-exilic Jews never knew the cloud and the Glory. They only dwelt lovingly on the past. Meanwhile a new note is struck by Is 66.1-2, hinting that the material Temple is not so important in God's eyes; St Stephen at his trial will quote this, saying that it is not in temples made with hands that God dwells

(Ac 7.48). This shift of emphasis had already been prepared by Jeremiah's great promise of the New Covenant, to be written on men's hearts (Jer 31.31-33); and Ezekiel's corresponding promise (Ez 36.26-28). The latter, while not naming either Covenant, Indwelling or Glory, uses the language and imagery of this group of theological ideas. God promises to put his Spirit in the hearts of his regenerate people, (just as Is 66.2 puts the emphasis on humility of spirit as being what pleases God most), and uses the consecrated Covenant-phrase: 'You shall be my people, and I will be your God.' The reader may be wondering how the same man could be so attached to the vision of the temple restored and inhabited by the Glory, and also give the oracle just quoted; but the mystery of Ezekiel is a subject of its own. The other examples quoted show how both points of view were in the air. As Christians we may say that the promises of the restored Temple were to be understood one day of Christ's body, and that the promise of the indwelling Spirit would then be in no conflict with the other.

Shekinah and Doxa

In the rabbinical period there developed a word from the root ShKN, dwell, which came to be more and more important: *Shekinah*, indwelling. In the Aramaic targums (paraphrases of the Hebrew OT) the word comes to be used as a reverent substitute for God himself, just as *shema*, the Name, supplanted the use of 'Yahweh'. The *shekinah* is not the Glory but the fact of its indwelling; nor is it a hypostasis, though naturally it is often grammatically a personification. But when the OT was put into Greek, distinctions became blurred. The word chosen for *kabod* was *doxa*, a word of intellectual connotation. In classical Greek it normally means opinion, as a mental activity; then, as the opinion that people have about someone, it means fame or glory. It was thus not an ideal word to render *kabod*, and the concept of God's glory, like many other Hebrew concepts, underwent a considerable development in Hellenistic-Jewish usage. The stress naturally came to be on how God is manifested. Many Hebrew words, and also the later *shekinah*, are ingredients in the developed Hellenistic-Jewish *doxa*, and the latter is used in many places where the original is far from the Hebrew concept of 'glory'. (For example, in Ex 33.19-20 God says 'I will make all my goodness pass before thee', but says that Moses cannot see his face. In the Greek he says 'I will pass before thee in my glory!') However, *doxa* does not take us away from splendour, light and beauty; rather, the word drops its sense of 'opinion' and concentrates on those senses. One more Greek word should be considered: *skene*, tent, and its verb *skenoun* are used evidently with appreciation of the similarity of sound to *shakan*. *Skene* renders both *mishkan*, tabernacle, and *shekinah*, indwelling.

The Incarnation and the Transfiguration

In the New Testament two distinct applications of the foregoing material are to be found. In the gospels, especially Lk and Jn, the language and imagery of the *shekinah* are implicit in the accounts of

the Incarnation. Secondly, in St Paul, St Peter and the Apocalypse the New Covenant of Jeremiah and Ezekiel is seen as realized in the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the Church, Christ's Body and Temple, and thereby in each member. Here the first point will be illustrated only from St Luke.

In Lk's account of the Annunciation (1. 26-38) overtones of the Covenant theme are constantly present. It was for the House of David (1. 32) that the promises were most explicit, and thereby Sonship of God was first promised (2 Sam 7. 14). Mary's acceptance (1. 38) is very like the people's ratification of the Covenant in Ex 24.7. But most striking of all is the phrase 'The power of the Most High shall overshadow thee'; here there is a direct use of the *shekinah* imagery. In the Syriac (here identical with Aramaic) the same word (*gan*) is used here for 'overshadow' and in Jn 1. 14 for 'dwelt' (*eskenosen*), and the latter passage continues 'And we saw his glory, glory as of the Only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.' 'Grace and truth' here represent the Hebrew *hesed we-'emeth*, the qualities which characterize the Covenant. St Luke is touching this group of concepts, and we are merely recognizing his implicit meaning when in the Litany we call Our Lady 'Ark of the Covenant', for the Ark was the throne of the indwelling Glory, and Christ is the New Covenant in person.

The Glory is apparent in the Nativity story (Lk 2. 9-14), but not precisely in the aspect of the *shekinah*. For this we must look above all to the Transfiguration, and especially in Lk. This account is full of theological allusions, but there is no space here to develop the peculiar significance of Moses and Elias (cf. Ex 33-4, 1 Kgs 19. 8ff.) and of the use of *exodos* (Lk 9. 31). St Luke has already shown his faith that the Glory dwelt in Jesus, though normally invisibly. On Tabor, to the privileged three, it is allowed to shine through the body which Christ himself called the Temple (cf. Mk 14. 58 and Jn 2. 19). They saw his glory.' (Lk 9. 32) Peter babbles 'Let us build three tabernacles.' What more natural, for the Glory to dwell in? But the cloud descends and overshadows them, hiding the Glory, and from the cloud God speaks, as on Sinai, but no longer giving a covenant written on stones, but manifesting the living Covenant.

The Indwelling in the Church and its members

In St Paul the *shekinah* concept, as it is studied in this essay, is appropriated to the Holy Spirit. Christ dwells in us (Gal 2. 20) but not as in a temple. (Of course the divine Persons act as one; but still, the Bible speaks the language of appropriation, and we should contemplate the truths taught us by this means before we apply theological correctives to our own vision). The reason is that Christ himself is the dwelling-place of God's Glory, in his risen, glorified body. St Paul does not take up explicitly the saying which must be behind Mk 14. 58 (cf. Jn 2. 19), but it is implicit in his language that Christ is the new Temple. All the fullness of the Godhead dwells in him bodily (Col 2. 9, 1. 19) and in his face shines the glory of God (2 Cor 4. 6). But by the gift of

his Spirit Christ has raised all who believe in him to be sons in him (Gal 4. 6, Rom 8. 9-16; cf. Jn 1. 12). This is the meaning of St Paul's constant refrain 'in Christ Jesus'. The regenerate are in his body, and the fullness and glory that are in him overflow on to all: thus Col 2. 9 continues 'and in him . . . you have received of that fullness'. If St Paul does not speak of Christ's material body as a temple, he does thus speak of the Mystical Body. 'In him the whole structure is closely fitted together and grows into a temple holy to the Lord: in him you too are being built together into a dwelling place for God in the Spirit.' (Eph 2. 21-22) St Peter has a closely parallel image (1 Pet 2. 5), whereby we are the living stones being built up into a 'spiritual house, a holy priesthood'. The latter phrase reminds us once again that the group of images belongs to the Covenant theme (cf. Ex 19. 6). The Covenant-phrases are used again in 2 Cor 6. 16ff: —

For you are the temple of the Living God, as God says:

'I will dwell and move among them,

I will be their God and they shall be my people . . .

I will be a Father to you, and you shall be my sons and daughters.'

(The latter phrase is not explicit in any of the classical Covenant passages, but is implicit in the extension of the Davidic Covenant of sonship to many sons and daughters in Is 43. 6).

The concept of the Church as the Temple of God is to some extent eschatological, and thus it comes (with all the Covenant-phrases) as the climax of the Apocalypse, as the revelation of the perfected beauty of the Bride of Christ (bridal imagery is of course an essential expression of the Covenant since Hos 2, Jer 2. 1, Ez 16 etc: hence 2 Cor 11. 2, Eph 5. 25-31):

Blessed are the dwelling place, Hebrew mansion of God with men,

and he will dwell with them (Christians), and they will be his people,

and God himself will be with them as their God (Apoc 21. 1-3).

Yet this glory is not entirely in the future; we may 'have this treasure in earthen vessels' (2 Cor 4. 7), but we have really got it, a new principle of life transforming us from within (cf 2 Cor 3. 18).

What is true of Christ's Body as a whole is secondarily true (and this is the right order to think of it) of all Christ's members individually. Thus St Paul, in exhortations to purity, applies the truth that we are temples of the Holy Spirit in both ways; 1 Cor 6. 19 says to all individually what 1 Cor 3. 16-17 and 2 Cor 6. 16 say to all together. Finally, the language of the Incarnation, of the overshadowing of Mary by the Spirit and power of God, is applied to the individual Christian. 'Gladly therefore will I glory in my infirmities, that the strength of Christ may dwell in me' (2 Cor 12. 9), or 'rest upon me' (Greek *epi-skenosei*; Syriac, a form of *zan* again). So also 1 Pet 4. 14, making exactly the same point, that the Christian's way to glory is through suffering (cf Lk 24. 26): 'If you are upbraided for the name of Christ, blessed will you be: because the honour, the glory and the power of God and his Spirit rest upon you.'

The biggest single group of allusions to the *shekinah* concept in the NT is in 2 Cor, though that epistle is not 'about' this subject. It may be

of interest to give here a list of passages where the notions of the Glory, the Tabernacle and the *Shekinah* are present: 2 Cor 3. 7-4. 6; 5. 1-5; 6. 16-18; 12. 9 (cf 13. 3-4).

In conclusion it may be stressed again that the NT writers see especially the Holy Spirit at work when they use or allude to the language of the *Shekinah*. Is the Holy Spirit the Glory? No; probably the Glory was never personified, though it is corporally contained by Christ. For the Christian, the glory of the divine indwelling is best referred to the image of God, restored by our regeneration in Christ; so St Ignatius says in the *Contemplation to obtain divine love*, point 2, 'again, making me a temple for himself, since I am created to the image and likeness of his divine majesty'. 'We all, with faces unveiled, reflecting as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are being transformed into his very image from glory to glory, as through the Spirit of the Lord.' (2 Cor 3. 18)

NOTES AND COMMENTS

QUID RETRIBUAM DOMINO?

GOD created man out of pure liberality: he is the giver *par excellence*. No operation of his creatures can ever add anything to his infinite glory and happiness. Why then did he create man? Infinitely wise, he surely had a goal in so doing. This purpose was the communication of his own perfections. Hence, in his dealings with God, man can only receive from him. And the more he receives, the more he is fulfilling God's loving plans.

But it would seem that God might somehow benefit from his faithful servants who work for his greater glory. Even then, man is the only one to benefit. Indeed, glory may be defined as a knowledge bursting, so to speak, into praise. God's glory as it exists in God himself never changes, for it is infinite. But God's glory as it exists in man can always increase, because the earthly knowledge of God, based on faith, is most imperfect and limited. Thus in working for God's glory what does one attain? This only, that he enkindles and fosters the knowledge and the love of God in himself and in others, under the divine direction of the Holy Spirit.

To that end, what better means than the liturgy could be found? For liturgy does not only propose the mysteries of Jesus' life for our contemplation, but, through the sacraments, it enables us to partake of the very life of God and become his children. This participation of man in the knowledge, love, and life of God constitutes God's glory on earth. It certainly benefits man immensely, but not God. One sees how rightly St Augustine observed: 'nobis . . . expedit Deum nosse, non illi.' After quoting this sentence, St Thomas concludes: '. . . and hence it is clear that God seeks his glory, not for his own sake, but for ours' (S.T. 2 2, 132, 1 ad 1); for such is God's infinitely unselfish desire to communicate his own perfections.

The same may be said with regard to prayer. Indeed, by prayer, man acknowledges his complete dependence on God and in so doing disposes himself to receive new graces. Prayer deepens his receptive capacity; it purifies and removes the obstacles to God's action. 'We praise and reverence God, not for himself, for his glory is infinite and cannot be increased by his creature: but for ourselves, because in praising and reverencing God, our soul submits to him and so achieves its perfection.' (S.T. 2/2, 81, 7 corpus) In other words, prayer does not cause any change in God, neither in his intentions, nor in his judgments: change can only take place in the creature.

If such is the case, if prayer does not change God but me, how can my prayer be of any help to someone else and particularly to the souls in purgatory? The dogma of the communion of saints, or the interdependence of men in good and evil, supplies the answer. Directly, my good actions (here prayer for my neighbour) bring perfection to myself, but by a kind of mysterious intercommunication, through the Mystical Body of Christ, they become fruitful for others. Moreover, it may well happen that God makes use of my prayer, as an instrument, to act on another man. As regards the souls in purgatory, it is certain that my prayers bring them spiritual consolations in their sufferings. But how do these prayers make satisfaction for their sins and hasten their release? An indication of a solution may be found in the fact that there is always some suffering connected with prayer. The soul in purgatory, which loves me and comes to know this suffering of mine, cannot but experience towards me a special movement of compassion, which contributes to purify it further and so hastens its release.

So far, we have shown that the interior aspect of liturgy, that is prayer, is directed to man's benefit, not to God's. As regards its exterior part, it is equally obvious that God does not need it. 'We worship God with external sacrifices or gifts, not for his sake, but for our own and for the sake of our neighbours: for he does not need our sacrifices; but he wants them offered to him for the sake of our devotion and the advantage of our neighbours.' (S.T. 2/2, 30, 4 ad 1) In the Old Testament God prescribed external sacrifices; they were to express man's interior attitude towards him and to assure the spiritual progress of his people. He ordered those acts because he wanted to justify and save man. Under the New Covenant, the sacraments not only dispose man to receive God's grace, but they confer it on him. But, here as before, God does not profit at all, though man benefits immensely more than under the Old Law.

Therefore, whatever good he does, man is always receiving from God. Is he working for God's glory? Then he acquires for himself and his neighbour a knowledge, a love and, what is even more, a life, which are his greatest possessions, his noblest achievements. Is he praying? He disposes his soul to receive God's gifts in greater abundance. Is he participating in the exterior part of the liturgy, in the sacraments of the Church? Life flows into him, makes him God's child, heir of the Kingdom together with Jesus, the very Son of God.

God's loving and infinite liberality appears so strikingly that man cannot but desire to render love for love. Recognizing his constantly increasing debt, he desires to give God something in return. 'Quid retribuam Domino?' Unable to contribute anything of himself, he offers God his own gifts and first of all the gift of his Son. By so doing, he is acting out of charity, for an unselfish motive. But the more unselfish his motive, the more he benefits, 'for he that shall lose his life for my sake, shall find it' (Mt 16. 25).

(For a more exhaustive treatment of the same topic cf. J. Lécuyer, C.S.Sp., 'Réflexions sur la théologie du culte selon saint Thomas', *Revue Thomiste* 55 (1955) 339.)

Amédée Payeur, S.J.

THE PRAISE OF HIS GLORY

The Pauline *laus gloriae* in the writings of a twentieth-century mystic.

THE ideal of perfection can become for the Christian, paradoxically enough, his greatest temptation in his pursuit of sanctity. In fact, perfection can easily degenerate, in the mind of the Christian, into a sort of self-embellishment, whereas sanctity is essentially self-forgetfulness and whole-hearted self-dedication to the love and praise of God's glory.

This has been very forcibly brought out in the life and writings of Sister Elizabeth of the Trinity, the young Carmelite of Dijon (1880-1906). Apart from her correspondence with relatives and friends, her writings consist mainly of her now famous *Prayer to the Trinity* and two 'retreats' *Heaven on Earth* and *The Last Retreat of Laudem (sic) Gloriam* (1). These two retreats both written a few months before her death, have rightly been considered as her little *Summa* and have ranked her, at least in the eyes of several theologians, with the greatest mystical writers.

It is indeed remarkable how deeply Elizabeth penetrated into the Christian message as expounded especially by St Paul and St John: the call to share in Trinitarian life, through and in Christ, for the praise of God's glory. And it is no less remarkable how consciously and reflectively she made that the great reality of her spiritual life. The mystery of predestination was for her nothing else but that. The two Pauline texts which allude to it (Rom 8. 29-30; Eph 1. 4-6) were her favourite scriptural quotations and during the last two years of her life could never leave her pen. This mystery, far from injecting into her that fear so acutely experienced by all those who had tried before her to probe into it, from St Augustine to the Protestants and Jansenists, was for her a constant source of joy and reassurance.

How does Elizabeth understand the Pauline *laus gloriae*? For her this idea is a complex one and very rich in meaning. Yet let it be noted at once that hers was not the aim of the theologian, much less that of the exegete. It is true that, according to some of her commentators, what is most striking in her is her doctrinal sense. Nevertheless we ought to see in her a soul who is simply trying to draw from the revealed word of God all its spiritual import.

Elizabeth does not speak so much of how to praise God's glory as of how *to be* the praise of God's glory. The Christian is called not merely to praise God but to become himself the praise of God by reflecting in himself the goodness and the bounty of God towards men. Such a Christian will love God with supreme disinterestedness, will be completely responsive to his action, and will be utterly receptive of the divine communication to him; while yet on earth, he will continually adore and give thanks like the blessed of the Apocalypse. The only ascetical practice which appeals to Elizabeth is 'silence', by which she means thorough self-forgetfulness and avoidance of exterior dissipation on the one hand, and on the other hand exclusive concentration of all her faculties on God. Only then is God at liberty to give himself to the soul 'according to the measure of the giving of Christ'; only then is the soul 'free' and able to enjoy real happiness.

As could be expected from the Pauline character of her spirituality, Elizabeth is wholly Christ-centred. For her Christ fills all the picture. It is his Spirit who makes us 'conformable to his image', and it is in Christ that consequently we are adopted as sons of God. Her desire to be transformed into Christ, to live by his and not by her own life, gives her asceticism of silence a deep significance. That is how she interprets the '*quotidie morior*' of St Paul. Predestination in Christ is first and foremost association in his Passion. This thought 'obsessed' Elizabeth with joy, as she herself privately confessed, and it was it which gave her the strength to suffer heroically in her last illness. In her prayer to the Trinity, she begs the Spirit of Love to 'reproduce, as it were, an incarnation of the Word, that I may be to him another humanity wherein he renews his mystery'. Only in the identification of herself with Christ could her life become a reflection of him who is the 'brightness of the Father's glory'.

But what rivets Elizabeth's attention is not so much Christ in his humanity as Christ in his spiritualized and glorified state and continuously revealed to the world by the Holy Spirit. Like St Paul she could say that she no longer knew the Son 'according to the flesh' (2 Cor 5. 16). This explains, perhaps, her predilection for St Paul and St John rather than for the Synoptics.

To be divinely adopted as sons in the Son is already to 'enjoy the fellowship' of the Trinity, to be made 'partakers of the divine nature'. Elizabeth speaks of this mystery in terms of the indwelling of the 'Three' in the soul, who make her earthly life an 'anticipated heaven'. Time is for her, as it was for St John of the Cross from whom she borrows the expression, 'eternity begun and ever in progress'. She realized most vividly that her life of love on earth was a true beginning, in what she called 'an eternal now', of the life of glory in heaven. The difference between the two was not one of kind but of manner. Love is already possession but 'in a state of obscurity'; in a sense it is even 'vision', though not of the essence of God, but of the divine love.

The mystery of the indwelling was for Elizabeth the great reality of her whole spiritual life and the central point of her whole doctrine.

She describes her own mystical experiences in terms of it. To recollect herself was to 'enter into herself and lose herself in Those who are there'; to cast herself into the abyss of her own nothingness is to cast herself into the abyss of the immensity of God. To meet the Lord she must retire to the 'centre of her soul' (an expression used also by St John of the Cross) where the Trinity dwells. The Trinity is her heaven on earth, her retreat, her beatitude, her heaven beforehand, her life of eternity begun. To be a 'domestic of God' means to 'abide in the bosom of the tranquil Trinity in the innermost depths of herself'. As a soul specially favoured by God, Elizabeth was certainly given the gift of infused contemplation which redounded intensely on her sensitive faculties. Yet, she tells us, never for a moment did faith cease to be her only guiding light. She loved repeating to herself and to others what St Paul says about the nature of faith (Heb 11. 1). The soul need not worry about impressions, imagination or feelings, which in any case are always to be mistrusted, so long as it is always nourished and guided by the 'fair light of faith'.

Salvino Azzopardi, S.J.

Notes :

- (1) Reproduced in 'The Spiritual Doctrine of Sister Elizabeth of the Trinity' by P. M. Philipon, O.P., Mercier Press, 1947. Cf. H. Urs von Balthasar, 'Elizabeth of Dijon', Harvill Press, 1956, for a further interpretation of her doctrine.

MANIFEST IN GLORY

ALL the meanings we can think of while dealing with the term 'glory' are eminently relevant when they are applied to Christ (of the word *doxa* a very good exegesis can be found in Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, band II, p. 236ff), but in the context of St Paul's theology the *glory* of Christ has another complementary meaning: his glory is also our glory. St Paul speaks about the 'manifold splendour (*doxa*) of this secret . . . Christ'. Yet this Christ is 'Christ among you' and 'your hope of glory (*doxa*)' (Col 1. 27). Our salvation is in Jesus Christ (he writes to Timothy) 'cum gloria caelesti' (2 Tim 2, 10). Finally, there is a clear causal link, as we have seen, between the glorious manifestation of Christ and our own manifestation 'in glory with him' (Col 3. 4).

It would give rise to a sort of mental fireworks to imagine different possible ways in which God could make us share in the Beatific Vision, without any respect to the glorious Humanity of Christ. But such a hypothesis does not appeal to us. The actual fact is staggering in its simple magnificence: Christ is the centre of all things, 'the first birth which precedes every act of creation. In him all created things took their being. He is the head whose body is the Church' (Col 1, 16-18). It is therefore highly convenient, even necessary in the present order of Providence, that Christ's glory should be, too, the way in which our glory ultimately tends to God.

When we speak of the glory of Christ, we mean chiefly the eschatological state of Christ which begins with the Resurrection. It will give

more unity to these considerations and perhaps will be more in accordance with St Paul's chief approach to the mystery of Christ.

The whole mystery of Christ is glorious. If we think in terms of the definition of God's glory, there cannot be a closer communication of his goodness to mankind than the Incarnation itself. That is the glory of the Only-begotten which shines forth in the darkness, as St John says at the beginning of his gospel. If we think in terms of Christ's personal happiness, of the brightness of his Beatific Vision, we can catch a glimpse of it when considering the Transfiguration. To contemplate his glory, however, was a privilege of only three men who would always remember the vision they had 'on the holy mountain' (2 Pet 1. 18).

Nevertheless, the stream of Christian joy with Christ and through Christ reaches its full flood after his Resurrection. It can take different forms. It can be experienced as a friendly community of feelings or as a mystical state or as an endless eschatological glory.

The first form is what we may call an ascetic sharing in the joy of Christ. St Ignatius teaches us to 'ask for grace to be intensely glad and to rejoice in such great glory and joy of Christ' (221). It is not the Beatific Vision obviously, yet it is something preliminary and necessary. No other motive of supernatural joy can be found which exercises so great an appeal on a Christian mind as that. It is enough for a member to rejoice, to know that his head, his life, the hope of his glory, is truly and absolutely joyful and triumphant.

But such an attempt to partake of Christ's glory in the best possible ascetic way does not go further than that. It is for the mystics to speak of the fathomless joy a soul can experience in contact with the risen Humanity of Christ. Its content transcends all description, although it does not reach the plenitude of the Beatific Vision. St Teresa once saw 'his hands, and his hands only. The beauty of them was so great that no language can describe it.' (Life, XXVIII, 2) On another occasion she saw 'the most Sacred Humanity, as painters represent him after the Resurrection.' And she sums up her impressions in this way: 'If in heaven itself there were nothing to delight our eyes but the great beauty of glorified bodies, that would be excessive bliss, particularly the vision of the Humanity of Jesus Christ our Lord.' (Life, XXVIII, 4)

This last idea brings us to the main point: our eschatological glory through Christ. And we take it, not in its imperfect stage before the resurrection of the body, but after it, when man will be able to feel this bliss as a whole, putting in movement all his senses and faculties. The risen man will exercise this human activity in union with Christ (some theologians like to say that Christ will be an '*instrumentum coniunctum, manifestativum divinitatis*'). Man will become similar to Christ: '... we know that when he comes we shall be like him' (1 Jo 3. 2) and will abide in the same mansion as Christ (Jo 14. 3). There is no need to separate the glory produced by Christ as a Man from that produced by the Divinity. It would spoil the unity of our human activity as a whole. Christ is God and reveals the Father in himself, not as an objective medium, but by the very nature of his hypostatic union. As he cannot

be conscious of his Humanity without seeing it at the same time assumed by the Divinity, so everything he has or experiences or manifests leads on by its own nature to God, who pervades his Humanity with a kind of quasi-formal causality, whatever the nature of this causality may be. Christ, Man and God, becomes the most suitable way for men to know the Father, and he himself meant to do that when he said: 'And I will reveal thy name to them.' (Jo 17. 26) The process is obvious: a perfect knowledge of his Humanity requires that of the hypostatic union; but this knowledge necessarily brings us to the knowledge of the Word and ultimately to the Father, from whom he proceeds. Even in the lower stages, that is *in via*, it is impossible for a soul not to appreciate the overpowering glare of the Divinity shining forth through the glorious flesh of Christ. That is why St Ignatius advises us 'to consider how the Divinity appears in the most holy Resurrection' (223). Lastly, when St Paul says: 'Christ is your life, and when he is made manifest, you too will be made manifest in glory with him', the meaning of the term *phanerôthê* would ultimately include the manifestation of the Divinity — the Father — in Christ, which, being communicated to us through knowledge and love, will make us truly manifest and glorious, too, in a glory such as becomes a member of the glorious Christ.

This note has been inspired by J. Alfaro's article 'Cristo Glorioso, Revelador del Padre', *Gregorianum*, 30(1958) 222. These are some considerations on the last part of it.

Luis Guillén, S.J.

REVIEWS

The Tombs of St Peter and St Paul. By Engelbert Kirschbaum, S.J.
(Translated from the German by John Murray, S.J.) Secker & Warburg, 1959. 45s.

HAS the tomb of St Peter really been found? What does his tomb look like? Where are his bones now? What do we know about St Paul's grave? How do the heads of the two Apostles come to be in the Lateran Basilica?

These are only some of the questions that Fr Kirschbaum tries to answer. As one of the four archaeologists who conducted the recent excavations of that part of the crypt of St Peter's Basilica traditionally associated with the tomb of the Apostle, he is able to describe them in detail; so that, with the aid of many excellent photographs and drawings, the reader is able to appreciate the difficulties and joys of the search.

Having described the excavations, the author uses them to reconstruct the history of the Apostle's burial place. He traces its development through the ages, from a simple earthen grave, covered with a few brick slabs, to the complex ornamented shrine, surrounded by a magnificent Basilica, which is ours today. This chapter is most readable and makes it possible for a wider public to learn, with a minimum of labour, what the experts have discovered.

The work of the archaeologists has thrown new light not only on the tomb, but also on the relics themselves, both of St Peter and of St Paul. Hence the last chapter is devoted to a discussion of the vicissitudes through which these relics have passed.

As one reader, probably among many, who has never visited St Peter's Basilica, this reviewer thinks that the book ought to contain an explanation of the geography of the Basilica as it stands today; for this would help to clarify the account of the excavations. For the same reason such terms as 'open *Confessio*' might be explained more carefully.

The question which most of us want this book to answer is: 'Did they really find the tomb?' Certainly no plaque was found with the words: 'This is the grave of Simon Peter.' What, then, did they find? A brief description of the main evidence may be of interest.

Tradition places the grave of the Apostle directly below the Niche of the Pallia, which lies underneath the Papal Altar. Behind the Niche of the Pallia lies the crypt chapel of Clement VIII. The excavations commenced when they broke into the wall between this chapel and the Niche of the Pallia. Behind it was found a white marble façade, which proved to be part of a structure dating from Constantinian times, at least $8\frac{1}{2}$ ft high, $8\frac{1}{2}$ ft broad and more than 5 ft deep, which surrounds the Niche of the Pallia on three sides. From the grooving and other features close by it the investigators were able to build up a picture of what the structure originally looked like. In 1906 a 5th century, ivory casket was unearthed at Samagher in Istria, depicting on its rear side, a liturgical ceremony in front of a structure surrounded by spiral columns. The experts have always connected this picture with St Peter's Basilica; and it was the back of the structure (on the casket) that the archaeologists had now discovered. But what was it? Certainly not an altar. St Peter's itself was built by Constantine on the side of a hill, despite the difficulties involved, because this site was traditionally revered as the grave of the Apostle. What then are we to say of a marble structure centrally placed in the Basilica, in front of which liturgical ceremonies were held, and which is of the same characteristic design as the other memorials built by Constantine to mark the places of historic value to the Christian religion? Clearly, we have here evidence of a 4th century belief that the tomb of the Apostle lay under this memorial.

Inside Constantine's marble memorial was discovered another

onument, which at a lower level was connected with some of the ausoleums of the Vatican Cemetery, all of which date from the 2nd ntury. The date of this inner monument was fixed at about 160 A.D. contained inscriptions (*graffiti*) written on the plaster of the walls, milar to those often found on the tomb of a martyr; and one of them, ritten not later than the beginning of the third century, contains the uncated name of Peter (PETR...). Now Eusebius quotes a passage om Gaius, who lived in Rome about 200 A.D., in which Gaius offers show the reader the tomb (or *Tropaion*) of St Peter at the Vatican. his monument dating from 160 A.D. could only be the *Tropaion* of aius.

In front of the *Tropaion* and at the sides of it is a 2nd century aveyard, which because of the complete absence of cremation seems to ave been Christian. Some of these graves are later than the *Tropaion*, ome are even post-Constantinian, but a few date from the last quarter f the 1st century. All these graves crowd round the *Tropaion*, one on p of the other, as though some virtue were to be found in proximity o it. Only one spot is left untouched, the area of the *Tropaion* itself. ere there is an underground chamber, older than the *Tropaion*, which as made accessible when the *Tropaion* was built. In this chamber were ound the bones of one man, of an elderly but powerful man, though is skull was missing. In this chamber was the burial place which all the vidence suggests, nay demands, was that of St Peter.

Anthony Horan, S.J.

The New Translations of the Bible. By E. H. Robertson. SCM Press Ltd., 1959.

A LARGE book is a great evil,' said Herodotus. This book is not large and not bad. On the contrary, it is just about the right length or a student like the present scribbler who always reads books at one itting if he can; and, once started, it makes an uninteruptable and ascinating sitting. So much so that, having risen somewhat cramped rom the long sitting, the said scribbler at once hobbled to the Editor of he Commentary to ask permission to review '*The New Translations of he Bible*' by E. H. Robertson in these pages, so as to bring it to the otice of his fellow-students.

It is a most readable book, with an easy, flowing style and many ively comments. Mr Robertson begins with the Authorized Version and nds with a New Translation, planned to appear next year, in which the ranslator's first concerns are accuracy and intelligibility. Of course most of the book is about non-Catholic translations of the Old and New Testaments, for as the editor says in Chapter Ten, entitled 'A Roman Catholic Translation': 'Compared with Protestants, the Catholics have a slender tradition of independent translators; but there is a tradition, which was eventually to flower in the translation by Ronald Knox.' (p. 157) This statement is kind rather than true; the Knox translation cannot

be regarded as the flowering of Catholic tradition; Knox owed nothing of his intellectual formation to Catholic institutions and turned his back deliberately on the Douai-Rheims tradition.

When Mr. Robertson is showing the differences of style in the various New Testament translations, he usually quotes the following passages: the Our Father (Mt 6. 9-13), the Magnificat, the three parables (Lk 15), and lastly St Paul's famous discourse on charity (1 Cor 13).

Perhaps the most striking chapter is the eleventh, 'A Jewish Translation', which is about 'the first attempt to prepare an English translation by a Jew' (p. 165). The translator, Mr Schonfield, thinks that a polished version in dignified language cannot reproduce the authentic tones of the New Testament literature; the original records have a diversity of style, 'infelicity of phrasing (and) much use of colloquialisms' (Introduction to *The Authentic New Testament*). He claims that the translator has to be as many persons as his strongly individualistic authors. His arrangement of the Gospels is most interesting. 'The Good News of Jesus Christ: Mark's Version' comes first. He divides the Acts into two parts: Part I is called, 'How the Good News came to Israel' and Part II, 'How the Good News came to the Gentiles'.

To give some idea of Mr Schonfield's style, here is his translation of the Our Father:

Our Heavenly Father, may thy name be sanctified, thy Kingdom established, thy will be obeyed on earth as it is in heaven. Give us to-day our needful food, and forgive us our failings, as we too forgive those who have failed us. And do not put temptation in our way, but shield us from harm.

One lesson to be learnt from Mr Robertson's excellent essay is that, as every serious translation casts fresh light here and there on the familiar text, for private reading it is desirable to have more than one version.

Michael Hewett, S.J.

For My Name's Sake, Catholic Resistance in Europe, 1939-1958. By Ronald Seth. Geoffrey Bles, London, 1958. 18s.

SINCE Our Lord's prophetic words were delivered: 'they shall lay their hands on you and persecute you, delivering you . . . into prisons, being brought before kings and rulers for my name's sake', the Church has never lacked persecution. But the Church has scarcely ever experienced so severe an attack in the course of her existence as in the 20th century from the Nazi and Communist regimes. There was a time when the number of priests in Dachau alone exceeded four thousand. And who can enumerate the victims of the Communists? Fighting for the fundamental human rights, the Catholic Church showed so much strength and courage that even non-Catholics were impressed and inspired. Among them was the author, Ronald Seth, who is not a Catholic, but who nevertheless has undertaken the task of writing the story of the Catholic Church's struggle against the tyrannies of our time.

Ronald Seth is a well-known author of more than a dozen spy books. He himself was attached to the Secret Service during the last

war and knows how to judge a resistance movement objectively. Perhaps that is why he could appreciate so much what the Catholic Church did against Nazism, has done and still is doing against Communism.

The first part of Mr Seth's book deals with the Nazi persecution of the Catholic Church in the occupied countries of Western Europe, in Holland, in Belgium, in occupied France, Austria and Italy. The author does not discuss events in Germany because—as he mentions in the preword—the situation there was too complicated. Instead he gives a chapter about Dachau, and what is said there is applicable to Mauthausen, Buchenwald, Auschwitz and any other concentration camp.

The second part of the book records the Church's struggle against Communist persecution. This struggle is not over yet. It continues day by day in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, in the German People's Republic, about each of which we find a chapter in the book, together with the events in the Baltic States, in Yugoslavia, Rumania and Albania. The last chapter recapitulates the 'technique' of the Communist persecution, which has the following main steps: (1) nationalisation of Church real estate; (2) nationalisation of schools and restriction on religious education in schools; (3) suppression of the Catholic organizations and religious Orders; (4) suppression of the Catholic Press; (5) a ban on all extra-ecclesiastical religious manifestations such as processions, pilgrimages, meetings, etc. (p.239) These are followed by the setting up of a schismatic 'National Church'.

A chart at the end of the book shows the execution of this technique in the different satellite countries. It demonstrates convincingly that the Communist persecution has been carried out systematically, though there have naturally been slight changes to suit special conditions.

The lay-out which Mr Seth has chosen for his book is that of a history book. He enumerates the main facts objectively and faithfully with but few comments of his own. If all his recording is as careful as that about the events in Hungary—with which the reviewer is more familiar—the book surpasses, on the score of exactness, all others on the same subject published till now. Nevertheless, one remark is needed. The picture which emerges after reading the book is a reliable but not a complete one. It does not convey vividly enough the atmosphere of persecution such as one finds in personal memoirs and anecdotes about private individuals. Though there are some such anecdotes, more would have been beyond the scope of the book and might even have obscured its documentary objectivity.

Erwin Nemesszeghy, S.J.

Children and Priest at Mass. By Hubert McEvoy, S.J. (Photographs by Anthony Powell, S.J.) Oliver & Boyd, 1959. 5s.

THIS booklet contains some forty pages of instruction and prayers, together with a series of fine photographs. It will prove useful to parent, teacher and child alike. Father McEvoy shows how the symbolism of the priest's simple and prayerful gestures at Mass can be used

to make the child attentive and recollected, despite the restlessness produced by confinement to church and pew.

The book is divided into seven parts: the preparation for Mass, from the time the child leaves home until the priest comes on to the altar; the acts of preparation (the prayers at the foot of the altar); of praise and instruction (the Introit to the Creed); of offering (the Offertory to the Oration Fratres); of sacrifice (from the Preface to the Pater-noster); of Communion (to the closing of the missal); and the conclusion of the Mass. Each section contains instructions such as 'Make the sign of the Cross when the priest signs himself with the paten', 'Bow your head when the priest does', followed by a short prayer and an explanation or thought for this part of the Mass. In this way the attention of the child is constantly directed to the actions of the priest, while the gestures provide a means of active participation, and the prayers and commentary raise the heart to God.

The book is printed clearly on glossy paper and has a stiff cover; its price is very moderate. It will be of value in preparatory schools and at children's Masses where the short prayers can be said in unison or the explanations given as a commentary.

John Grumitt, S.J.

- - - - -

The Story of Jesus. By Eleanor Graham. Puffin Books, 1959. 3s. 6d.

THIS story of the life of Christ is well written, and can be read right through with ease. This effect is probably due to the author's choice and arrangement of material, coupled with her use of simple narrative language throughout. Unfortunately the paraphrasing has entailed the omission of a large proportion of the doctrine contained in the Gospels, and a certain mitigation of the supernatural: the former may be noticed, for example, in the treatment of the parables of the Sower and of the Prodigal Son; while the latter appears in the incident of Christ's walking upon the waters and the account of the Last Supper. Although we cannot recommend *The Story of Jesus* for use in Catholic schools, on account of the omissions, it may prove valuable to those who use the Agreed Syllabus.

Anthony Lawn, S.J.

- - - - -

The Origin of Man. By Nicolas Corte. Burns and Oates, London, 1959. 7s. 6d.

THE appearance of this little book has come at an opportune time, for we can expect renewed interest in the problems of Evolution and Creation with the publication of Père Teilhard de Chardin's *Phenomenon of Man*. Once again the editors of the *Faith and Fact* series have called upon an expert, who has presented within the limits

of 140 pages a concise view of the whole problem. Nicolas Corte, we are informed, is the pseudonym of a distinguished priest and theologian who has made a special study of contemporary scientific developments with particular reference to evolutionary theories, palaeontology and prehistory. We are given a sketch of the background of the question of the origins of man. We see that all primitive peoples and civilizations elaborated their myths explaining the origin of the world and of the first men. The cosmogonies of early peoples may have been crude, but they did attempt to find an answer for their deep-seated desire for a clearer knowledge of their origins. The philosophers, particularly the Greeks, were equally anxious to solve the problem. They approached the matter in a more detached way and, though they were dealing with the same principle of causality which had been recognized by earlier peoples, they did not allow their imaginations to be over-stimulated by myths. Although Plato and Aristotle did not arrive at a satisfactory explanation of creation, they did recognize a First Cause closer to the Christian God than, for instance, the unattractive Atum and Marduk of the Egyptians and the Babylonians.

Having seen that the problem is at least as old as historical man himself, the author turns to the scientific approach to the origins of man. He reminds us that science is not concerned with the philosophers' final causes but only with proximate and immediate causes. Here we are confronted with the hard facts and figures which science provides. The author presents the findings of palaeontologists and prehistorians. He outlines the conclusions which the evolutionary scientist draws from these findings and is at pains to point out that it is impossible, from the nature of the purely scientific evidence so far available, to conclude definitely whether man sprang from one single pair (monogenism) or from several pairs which appeared simultaneously (polygenism). In order to show how open the scientific question of the origins of man remains, Père Teilhard de Chardin is quoted: 'At the distance at which man makes his first appearance, our intensest scrutiny is totally unable to discover the presence and activity of one unique pair. So that it might be said that in that gap there is room for anything that may be demanded by a transcendental source of knowledge'. (Pp. 135-136).

This quotation leads us to what the author rightly calls the most important chapter of the book, that which deals with our most reliable source of information, namely, divine revelation. In the Genesis account of the Creation we must always bear in mind that we are not now dealing with a 'book of science' but with 'a book of salvation'. We are impressed by the simple dignity of that inspired account of God's creation of man, soul and body, which contrasts with the creation stories of the myths.

In the final chapter we see that there is no reason to suppose that there must be conflict between the doctrine of the Church and those who favour evolution. Pius XII in the encyclical *Humani Generis* stated the Church's position in this matter. We may go along with the

scientists and admit the evolution of the body and that subsequently God created and infused a soul.

In a word, we have in this book a clear exposition, in non-technical language, of the main arguments of the scientists and of the teaching of the *magisterium* of the Church on the problem of the origin of man.

Peter Banyard, S.J.

CORRIGENDUM

We regret that the unfortunate omission of a line of the reviewer's MS from p.78 of the last number of *Bellarmino Commentary* made nonsense of a quotation from Mr H. Hagendahl's recent book *Latin Fathers and the Classics*. Mr Hagendahl was represented as saying that St Jerome 'had no first-hand knowledge of the secondary sources'. What Mr Hagendahl wrote (and the reviewer quoted) was that the Saint 'had no first-hand knowledge of the works of classical Greek philosophers, but derived his knowledge of them from secondary sources'. We take the opportunity of expressing our apologies to the author and the publishers.— Editor.